



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 148

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 11, 2002

No. 76

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 11, 2002.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN BOOZMAN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4775. An act making supplemental appropriations for further recovery from and response to terrorist attacks on the United States for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 4775) "An Act making supplemental appropriations for further recovery from and response to terrorist attacks on the United States for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House agreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints

Mr. BYRD, Mr. INOUE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. REID, Mr. KOHL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DORGAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. REED, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SPENCER, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. BOND, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BURNS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. GREGG, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CAMP-

BELL, Mr. CRAIG, Mrs. HUTCHISON, and Mr. DEWINE, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) for 5 minutes.

REPUBLICAN PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Here we go again, Mr. Speaker. Americans are still paying two and three and four times more for their prescription drugs than consumers in any other nation in the world. Twelve million seniors lack any form of prescription drug coverage, and millions more have inadequate coverage.

My Republican friends are poised to introduce prescription drug legislation that does not address either of these concerns. That is because the goal of their legislation is not to deliver meaningful prescription drug benefits to seniors or get a grip on unjustifiably high prices. Their goals are, one, to try to look responsive to the concerns of senior voters and their families, without actually investing enough to be responsive to their concerns; second, to do the bidding of the prescription drug industry, which is what my Republican friends always do; and, third, to privatize Medicare, the best health care system this country has ever seen.

How do they win political points? By mimicking some of the features of a

real drug benefit but investing only about one-third of the dollars needed to deliver real drug coverage. By starting with 80 percent coverage, which makes their plan look generous, then increasing the cost-sharing, the cost that seniors actually pay, dramatically as a senior's prescription drug price costs rise. Under the Republican plan, seniors who spend more than \$2,000 lose their coverage altogether, no more coverage for the next \$2,500 in expenses. Find me a single health insurance plan in the private sector that increases the cost-sharing burden as an enrollee's costs go up.

The Republican plan is so skeletal that seniors would still need supplemental prescription drug coverage if they wanted protection against high drug prices. The majority may dress up their plan in appealing rhetoric, but it is still a cheap imitation of real prescription drug coverage.

The Republicans' second goal is to do the bidding, no surprise here, of the prescription drug industry which, of course, favors the private plan approach. Remember the Flo ads from a couple years back, the ones where Flo said she did not want the government in her medicine cabinet? Those ads were funded by the drug industry. They were intended to demonize the idea of adding a drug benefit to the existing Medicare program. The drug industry favors bypassing Medicare and forcing seniors into private prescription drug plans.

Be prepared for the majority to claim its plan cuts drug prices by 30 percent per prescription. The Republican plan does not cut drug prices by 30 percent, in spite of what they say. Their plan reduces drug spending, not prices, and they do that mostly by restricting seniors' access to higher priced necessary medicines.

They are not doing seniors any favors with that strategy, and they certainly are not challenging their corporate

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3299